

nation, comprising a fourth of the whole human race, that the laws of their country, if fairly and honestly applied, provide for all their wants and secure to them the utmost liberty. Now, although the Chinese Government is nominal, despotic, it is practically one of the most democratic in the world.

The Revd. John Ross, in his admirable preface to the "Mandate," has clearly shown that his liberalism is like that of none other, being only for the good of the people. It is, as he says, "An absolute Government, founded upon and guided by democratic principles. And, although in China a rebellion may occur at any time, a revolution, properly so called, and as understood in the West, could hardly happen, at least so far as the people themselves are concerned; there could be no tearing down of the old and setting up of a new order of things; but simply a return to ancient principles: the reigning dynasty having ceased, in the popular mind, to rule sufficiently in conformity with the maxims of old must be set up."

Of course, it goes for the mere saying that China has much to learn from the West. At the same time, it would appear as if she had long ago solved many of the problems, political, social and moral which are to-day puzzling Western students.

Constitutional principles, which are but yesterday in Europe, are centuries old in China. The capitalist, that so-called vampire of the West, has practically no existence in China, where, like so many ants, each contributes his share to the general hoard and reaps to the full the reward of his own labour. There is no leisure class and every man must either work or starve.

Then again, China's attitude towards religion, I repeat, of course, of the educated classes, and has been for centuries much the same as that of our advanced thinkers and agrees to-day too with that of most of our educated classes even outside the church. "We cannot know it; how can we know death?" spoke the Chinese sage, over two thousand years ago. "Behind the veil! He in the veil!" is the beautiful language of our greatest modern poet.

In the West, freedom is associated with franchise. One man, one vote is the rallying cry of our pioneers of progress. Yet, in spite of all that has been written on the subject there is perhaps something of the nature of a fetish worship about representative government. The ideal of which, apparently, is the right of vote for another to vote, rather than to qualify oneself to become a ruler. It is like offering a stone in the place of bread.

In this respect, the Chinese are, at the present day, really a freer people than ourselves. For, whereas our rulers are all of a class—and that not necessarily the most intellectual, a seat in Parliament depending not so much upon intellectual capacity as upon money, influence and the "gift of gab"—the rulers of China are taken from the body of the people themselves and the standard of qualification, at least in principle, which is something, is intellect alone. It is true, the nominal ruler in the West, election is open to all rich and poor alike; but, as a matter of fact, how many of the rulers to-day are of the people and from the people? On the other hand, a considerable proportion of the official class in China, are men whose parents are among the very poor, and, if a labourer's son distinguishes himself, he is sure of office. With all our boasted nineteenth century freedom, it is a comparatively rare thing for a man to rise from a rickshaw to a position in the army and navy, or in the navy, such a thing is next to impossible.

After all, we are not in some respects, very much in the position of a little child, who, having discovered a few wonderful tricks, would teach his grandparents the whole art of living?

The vast majority of people are too prone to judge of civilization entirely from a standpoint of railways, telegraphs, big guns and huge edifices, forgetting that there are men, who, like the Chinese, have a more solid and lasting civilization than ours.

It is to be wondered at that China should be proud of her history and of a civilization which has served her so long and so well, and that she should cling so tenaciously to her grand old institutions and be loath to part with one of them, without a hard struggle? Should we not rather admire than despise her for it?

SUPREME COURT.

IN ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.

(Before Mr. E. J. Aickroyd, Acting Chief Justice.)

THE HOWQUA CASE.

The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, the Chartered Bank of India, Australia, and China, the Chartered Mercantile Bank of India, London, and China, the New Oriental Bank Corporation, Limited, and the Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris, Plaintiffs,

and John Murray Forbes, Ng Woon Sun Howqua, Cressy Ewens, and Ng Chow Fong, Defendants.

Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C., and Mr. E. Robinson, instructed by Mr. A. B. Johnson (of Messrs. Johnson, Stokes and Master), appeared for the plaintiffs, and Mr. J. Leach, Q.C., and Mr. E. H. Sharp, instructed by Mr. J. L. Donny and Mr. Cressy Ewens, represented Ng Woon Sun Howqua, Cressy Ewens, and Ng Chow Fong, Ho Tung, Ng Lai Shan, Ng Chan Wan, Ng Heung Lun, and Ng Pak Wan.

(Continued from yesterday.)

The case was heard before me on the 17th November last, when Mr. Francis, Q.C., and Mr. Robinson appeared for the plaintiffs and Mr. Leach, Q.C., and Mr. Sharp appeared for all the defendants except John Murray Forbes, who has not appeared to the writ served upon him and an order was made to proceed *ex parte* against him. Mr. Robinson having read the pleadings, Mr. Francis opened his case, put in the *de bene esse* examination of William Howell Forbes and called Mr. Sangster, the Acting Land Officer, who produced certain documents, to which allusion will be made later on. Mr. Sangster was cross-examined on the 16th November and Mr. Francis elected not to call any more or put in any evidence. Counsel were further heard on the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st December. It will therefore be seen how very meagre is the evidence in this important and intricate case. It appears to me that there were several points which if not absolutely essential to be cleared up would at least have thrown great light on the several circumstances of the case and would have greatly facilitated the decision thereof, but both parties seemed to shirk calling any more evidence than they were absolutely obliged to do, and to have relied on all the uncertainty attending the legal questions raised by the few facts which have been proved. For instance, there is no evidence tendered to show why or under what circumstances the letter of credit was given; and the question whether Russell & Co. were largely indebted at the time of the making of the letter of hypothecation; whether those debts

have since been paid off, when the schedule in the letter of hypothecation was filled in; what were the real dealings with certain properties mentioned in that letter which have since been sold; and what became of the sale price thereof; whether as stated in the 10th paragraph of the answer the Crown leases of the property in Hongkong were in 1888 surrendered and at the request of Mr. J. M. Forbes fresh leases were granted in his name alone for the purpose of giving effect to the said charge and for the better security of the mortgage so advanced, and, lastly, whether any steps had been taken to ascertain what stamp the Government required to be fixed to the letter of hypothecation, and why the document was registered unstamped as it is; all these are points upon which evidence could easily have been obtained and which if enquired into might have had an important bearing on my decision. There was a question raised on the pleadings whether this suit was defective for want of parties and also another question whether the writ of execution and the prohibitory orders issued were good against the partnership firm of Russell & Co. and of the several members thereof, or whether they were good only against William H. Forbes and C. A. Tomes. The trial of the first question has by consent been postponed and the other has been decided by a judgment dated the 2nd November, 1894.

Mr. Francis in the course of his opening and summing up, as argued and contended. The broad general question was, had Forbes on the 10th July, 1891, any interest in the property? Had he any charge for Howqua and for what amount? Did he ever advance any money out of the trust fund to Russell & Co., and was there any debt due on the 31st March, 1884, to Murray Forbes as trustee for Howqua and was there any valid charge created by the letter of hypothecation of the 31st March? He denies that the letter was a valid charge, but he was merely a piece of waste paper, as no property was included in it or referred to in it, nor were the title deeds representing that property handed over to J. Murray Forbes, but they were kept by Russell & Co. and dealt with as their own property. Was the greater portion of the debt paid off by June, 1886, and the property released as of that date? Did Murray Forbes in February and May, 1888, take the Crown leases as trustee for Howqua as alleged in the answer? Were Russell & Co. heavily indebted in 1884, and on the 10th July, 1891, any interest in the property? Did Russell & Co. hand the title deeds to Cressy Ewens and Ng Chow Fong and give them the possession of the properties on the 27th June, 1891, and was this under the authority of and to give effect to the letter of hypothecation of March, 1884? Was that transfer voluntary and with intent to defraud and defeat creditors and therefore fraudulent and void, or was it bona fide and for valuable consideration? Was the deed of trust of June, 1876, valid and duly registered or was it voluntary and fraudulent? Was the declaration of June, 1891, voluntary and with intent to defraud or delay creditors or was it bona fide for valuable consideration? He intended to show that the property in 1884 was the property of Russell & Co., and that up to 1882 Russell & Co. dealt with the property as theirs. That the defendants have to prove the property was duly hypothecated to them; that Murray Forbes was a trustee of it and that he was in possession of property or money for them and that he lent money out of the fund to Russell & Co.; that the money was due in 1884 and there was a debt not barred, because if there was no debt then this charge or settlement was a purely voluntary one. The defendants have to produce and prove the letter of hypothecation to explain the non-existence of the schedule, and why this letter was prepared and given at the date there stated. Secondly, what is the legal effect of such a letter of hypothecation without a schedule. That the defendants have to prove that they have a good charge and to substantiate every element and iota necessary to sustain it. That the plaintiffs deny that the title deeds ever came into the possession of John Murray Forbes. That assuming that the letter of hypothecation was of any value, defendants must prove that the assignments or transfers to Ewens and Ng Chow Fong were valid, and that includes the question whether the letter of hypothecation with the schedule attached at an unknown date was a valid document for registration. Was it properly stamped, and should it not have been registered before being put into force? Was the declaration of trust of June, 1891, validly executed as plaintiffs deny that the person who executed it had any power to do so, as even if the power of attorney given by express words to Mr. Murray Forbes was valid, and that includes the question whether the powers he pretended to exercise it would have been in breach of the powers given to Forbes. That the defendants have to prove that they are legally in possession of the property, and that William H. Forbes was entitled to hand them over the title deeds. These were the points urged by him in his opening, and in summing up, after briefly referring to the facts, he stated that upon the evidence of Mr. Forbes he was bound to hold that the letter of hypothecation was deliberately concocted, that up to the date of their bankruptcy Russell & Co. appeared as the owners of property absolutely unencumbered, and that the evidence showed that this property was encumbered for the payment of a debt larger than the value of the property. That after the bankruptcy the secret deed is produced, the title deeds are handed over by Forbes, and then the declaration of trust is produced. That he contended that this act and the putting them in possession and the production of the declaration of trust were acts which impeded and delayed the creditors, and he drew my special attention to them, as he contended that the action of William Howell Forbes was taken when the firm was hopelessly insolvent; that the declaration of trust by John Murray Forbes was a fraud on the creditors, and where there was a delaying or defeating of creditors I am to look at all the circumstances. There is no evidence that there was a valid charge or an actual trust, and that no man can remove his property from the reach of his creditors by merely making a declaration of trust. Speaking again of the letter of hypothecation he contended that at the time it was signed it was an absolute blank—it created nothing; it included property not purchased then, and yet this was the sole justification which William Howell Forbes had for handing over the title deeds and putting Ewens in possession. That as far as the evidence is concerned the schedule might have been put there three days before the registration. That according to the evidence of Forbes they did not know what they were going to hypothecate; there can be therefore no agreement between an assignor and assignee when they do not know what property is to be dealt with. That assuming the document is good in form, it is under the Statute 13 Elizabeth, chap. 5, absolutely null and void, because from its very nature and character it is calculated to delay and defeat creditors, as it could have been produced at any time, and he contended that under the Statute any disposal of property, whether voluntary or not, whether the assignor was or was not indebted at the time, if so framed, or likely to operate, so as to defraud or delay creditors present or future, if bearing on it the palpable marks of fraud as recognized by the Court of Justice, will be at once set aside if the Court finds that it is not bona fide, and if the effect of it is to defraud and delay creditors. Mr. Francis then referred to the Statute 13 Elizabeth, chap. 5, remarking that the first two sections avoided all seductive gifts, grants, etc., which had been devised or made with the intent or intent of delaying, hindering, or defrauding creditors

and others; that these sections were complete and contained no proviso or exception. That all deeds having the intent or purpose aforesaid were void. Section 6 made an exception only for estate. In lands, grants, etc., which had been upon good consideration and bona fide lawfully conveyed, etc., and the assignees must be innocent of the fraud. If any exists, Mr. Francis then proceeded to consider the recognized marks or badges of fraud. (1) The genuineness of the assignment. (2) The omission of the schedule which it does not invalidate the document is a badge of fraud. (3) The concealment of the charge, which is the greatest. (4) It is a badge of fraud if the document is not for the correct sum, and therefore the burden of proving the debt is on the defendant. (5) That the assignor remained in possession of the property. Mr. Francis then, as part of his speech, read passages from May on Fraud, dwelling particularly on passages respecting the badges of fraud which, unless satisfactorily explained, will be evidence of bad faith, viz., the genuineness of the gift; the continuance in possession; secrecy; fraudulent preference; and a debtor for the benefit of creditors to whom the conveyance is not communicated and who was not in any manner privy to it will not be good against other creditors; that the whole transaction must be free from doubt. Mr. Francis commented on the blank schedule, amounting practically to a power of revocation which has always been looked upon as a strong circumstance of fraud, and will in general make a deed void. Mr. Francis when alluding to other passages in May on Fraud, chap. 23, again referred to the burden of proof as resting on the plaintiff and answer and the facts of the case and then referred to the following cases (here follows a long list of authorities), and in the course of his argument on these various passages and authorities put forward two propositions.—1st. That no disposition of property for a valuable consideration will stand if the effect of it is to defraud or delay creditors; and, secondly, if there is fraud, or signs of fraud, it is immaterial whether the settlement was for valuable consideration or not or whether there were debts or not. Mr. Leach chiefly relies on the absence of evidence of any fraud given by the plaintiffs in support of his allegation contained in the paragraph of their petition that the whole of these pleadings are based solely and entirely on fraud or fraudulent intent, and contends that in that case, as this is a burden for valuable consideration, the whole burden of proof is on the plaintiff. That the plaintiff had alleged fraud in 23, they must come prepared to prove it; that he relies on Forbes's evidence to the effect that the security was given bona fide to J. M. Forbes because he had advanced trust money without security, and contends that there must be facts proved which would lead the Court to say that in the mind of Forbes at the time there was an intent to defraud. Mr. Leach then dealt with the several charges or evidence of fraud put forward by Mr. Forbes, and stated that he contended, pointing out the difference between cases of voluntary settlement and conveyances for valuable consideration, and after explaining the different facts, which Mr. Francis has termed badges of fraud, contended that these were all consistent with honest intention on the part of Howell Forbes to secure the sum advanced by J. Murray Forbes out of the Howqua trust; and that as it was for valuable consideration, must, looking at all the circumstances of the case, be satisfied there was no fraudulent intent. Suppliants are not sufficient; I must be satisfied that there was actual fraud. In a word, Mr. Leach's contention has been that the plaintiffs having alleged fraud, it is for them to prove it, and they have not done so. I will now proceed to set out the facts which I find admitted or proved. I will then refer to the large number of cases which have been cited and then give my grounds for my decision.

Beyond Mr. Forbes's statement that the letter was the first security given, and that the only object was to secure J. M. Forbes, as he should not have lent money without security, we have no evidence under what circumstances it was asked for, or given; but by letter or memorandum dated the 21st March, 1884, addressed to John Murray Forbes, Jr., trustees for Howqua, and signed "Russell & Co.," the said Russell & Co. acknowledged that they were depositing with him documents and securities for property of money hereunder mentioned as collateral security for the payment of our promissory note dated the 21st day of March, 1884, for the sum of two hundred and fifty-eight thousand, Shanghai currency, and interest thereon according to the rate of seven per cent. charged by year. The letter then went on to confer certain powers on the said John Murray Forbes. In case of default in the payment of the said sum, After the signatures are written in the same hand and ink as the body of the letter: "Particulars of securities above referred to." There is no doubt that, at the time the said letter was signed and handed over to John Murray Forbes no particular signature was added afterwards in another handwriting. At the bottom of that page and of the next are the initials "R. & Co.," which to all appearances were written at no place at the time of the signing of the letter. According to that schedule of particulars the following Hongkong real estate was pledged:—

Land Lot No. 84, The Hermitage.
Land Lot No. 148, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 149, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 151, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 152, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 153, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 154, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 155, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 156, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 157, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 158, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 159, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 160, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 161, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 162, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 163, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 164, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 165, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 166, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 167, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 168, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 169, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 170, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 171, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 172, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 173, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 174, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 175, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 176, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 177, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 178, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 179, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 180, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 181, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 182, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 183, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 184, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 185, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 186, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 187, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 188, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 189, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 190, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 191, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 192, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 193, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 194, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 195, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 196, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 197, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 198, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 199, Rose Hill.
Land Lot No. 200, Rose Hill.

Then comes mention of the Fochow property, the title deeds of which are said to be in J. M. Forbes's, Jan., in box in Hongkong (see W. H. Forbes's letter dated January 21st, 1885). The reference to this letter clearly proves that this schedule was written at no place at the time of the signing of the letter. Amongst the property mentioned in this schedule is Marine Lot No. 225. At the date of the letter of hypothecation it did not belong to Russell & Co., who bought it in July or August, 1884, and it was sold to Mr. Ewen Cameron on the 17th February, 1886. From these two dates, it is sought to infer when the schedule was added, with respect to the ownership of the landhold mentioned in that schedule, the 10th paragraph of the petition alleges that the whole of the contents of the plaintiffs and defendants are fully set out in the 10th paragraph of the petition and in the answer thereto. The only point in dispute seems to be whether this property was held by Murray Forbes as trustee for the firm Russell & Co. and for the successive partners thereof, or for himself and also other members of the firm, viz., William Howell Forbes and De Courcy Forbes. It was then wholly unencumbered. In the year 1888 the Crown leases for the properties in Hongkong were surrendered and fresh leases were granted in the name solely of John Murray Forbes; but, in support of the statement that these new leases were granted in the name alone solely for the purpose of giving effect to the said letter of hypothecation, the defendants have produced evidence, although they could easily have proved them and made the fact of the Court easier than it is at present. After considering the evidence of W. H. Forbes I find that these leaseshold in 1884 were the property of Russell & Co.; they were then registered in the name of J. M. Forbes and remained so until the registration of the letter of hypothecation. Of the lots of Hongkong property mentioned in the said schedule, as having been given as security, the following

have since the date of the letter been sold, namely:—

Island Lot No. 191, Rose Hill.
Island Lot No. 192, Rose Hill.
(To be continued in our next issue.)

NANKING.

NANKING, February 16th.

Nanking is soon to have a street railway running from the vicereine's Yamen to the steam landing at Hsiao Kwan. The coaches on this new railway are to be propelled by horse power. This is one step in the right direction, and we trust only the beginning of many new enterprises.

The general feeling among the Chinese is that the war does not trouble them, so long as the operations are confined to the north. However the rumour that a telegram has been received by the Viceroy that the Japanese had landed at Hsiao Kwan just above the mouth of the old Yellow River and were marching on Nanking has created some little stir. Since the populace have heard that the Japanese are treating the people well they have become much more reconciled than before, and not a few of the natives would really like to have a visit from the Japanese.

It is stated by those who ought to know that there are now twenty thousand troops in the city, and new recruits are being enlisted every day from among the coolie gamblers, and dead bodies are strewn about the streets and about the gates to go up, as it takes so many of the poles to supply the new recruits. These recruits are being drilled daily in the handling of these long rifles with spikes in the end. One would think that the reported wise statesman Chang Chih Tung had got beyond such nonsense as drilling men in the handling of these poles, hoping by such means to be able to defend the city.

A spirit of calmness and security prevails in the minds of many of the officials and people over the report that the British Government has instructed the Admiral of the British fleet not to allow the Japanese fleet to go up the Yangtze. It is quite common talk that England is going to help us. We have it on the best of authority that the British Admiral made the statement himself that the Japanese should not proceed up the Yangtze. If this is true, well and good for the Chinese, if not it is a great pity that they should be deceived by such reports. There is a perfectly quiet and foreigner notes were better treated in this city than at this time. The report of Admiral Ting's surrender has made apparently but little impression on the people, as they expect to hear of nothing but defeat.—China Gazette.

If the sufferer from Consumption, Scrofula and General Debility will try Scott's Emulsion of Pure Cod Liver Oil with Hypophosphites, they will find immediate relief and a permanent benefit. The Medical Profession in the various countries of the world universally declare it to be the most valuable and as it is very palatable it can be readily taken by the most sensitive stomach, and will never fail to give relief and comfort to the sufferer. Any Chemist can supply it.—Sole Agents for Hongkong and the Empire of China:—Watkins & Co., Hongkong.—Advt.

Today's

Advertisements.

DOUGLAS STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.
FOR SWATOW, AMOY AND TAIWANFOO.
The Company's Steamship

"THALES,"
Capt. H. Bathurst, will be despatched for the above ports on THURSDAY, the 28th instant, at Daylight.
For Freight or Passage, apply to
DOUGLAS LA PRAD & Co.,
General Managers.
Hongkong, 26th February, 1895. [291]

DIVING.
AN EXPERIENCED EUROPEAN
DIVER is open for ENGAGEMENT,
Apply to
c/o Hongkong Telegraph Office.
Hongkong, 26th February, 1895. [293]

PUBLIC AUCTION
OF
CHINESE PORCELAIN AND CURIOS.

THE Undersigned has received instructions to sell by
PUBLIC AUCTION,
on
SATURDAY, the 2nd March, 1895,
commencing at 2.30 P.M.,
at his SALE ROOM, DUNDALL STREET,
(Just reached from the North).
A VERY FINE COLLECTION OF
CHINESE PORCELAIN AND CURIOS,
Comprising—
FINE SPECIMENS OF VASES, DISHES,
BOWLS, &c., IN SAND-DE-BORUP, LIVER-
COLOR, BLUE & WHITE, APPLE GREEN,
BLACK and GOLD, BLUE and GOLD, EMPE-
RAL YELLOW, FIVE-CLAW DRAGON,
HAWTHORN and OTHER DECORATIONS,
from the MING DYNASTY, the Reigns of
KANG-HI, YUNG-CHING, KIEN-LUNG, to
more modern dates.

OLD BRONZES, CLOISONNES, FINE
JADE ORNAMENTS, CARVINGS, SNUFF-
BOTTLES, SILK EMBROIDERIES,
&c.
OTHER CURIOS.
Catalogues will be issued prior to Sale. On
View from Friday, the 1st March.
TERMS OF SALE—As customary.
GEO. P. LAMMERT,
Auctioneer.
Hongkong, 26th February, 1895. [292]

Amusements.

COOKE'S CIRCUS

AND
MENAGERIE
OF PERFORMING
WILD ANIMALS
will shortly arrive here for a short season from
Rangoon.
Hongkong, 22nd February, 1895. [299]

Notices of Firms.

NOTICE.

HAVING taken over the BUSINESS of the
late Mr. P. RAFF, I have THIS DAY
established myself as
AUCTIONEER, APPRAISER
AND
COMMISSION AGENT.
PAUL BREWITT,
No. 2, Zealand Street.
Hongkong, 1st February, 1895. [187]

Intimations.

PRE-EMINENT AND WHY?

PURE MEAT JUICE.

THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OF

PRIME OX BEEF.

CONTAINS 50 TIMES MORE NOURISHMENT THAN ORDINARY MEAT EXTRACT.

"MARROL"

OX-BONE MARROW, WITH HOPPED MALT EXTRACT.

FATTENING, ENERGY-FORMING, TISSUE BUILDING, BLOOD-PRODUCING.

SOLE CONSIGNEES,

WATKINS & CO.

66, Queen's Road Central.

KELLY & WALSH, LD.

AYRES CHAMPION TENNIS BALLS, 1895.

AYRES REGULATION TENNIS BALLS, 1895.

SALTER'S TENNIS RACKETS, all weights.

DEMON & SPECIAL DEMON RACKETS.

CROQUET SETS, Complete in Case.

INDIAN CLUBS, various weights.

DUMB BELLS, various weights.

HALMA: For TWO or FOUR PLAYERS.

THE POPULAR RACE GAME.

DRAUGHTS, CHESS, BEZIQUE, &c., &c., &c.

ALL OF THE ABOVE CAN NOW BE OBTAINED FROM

KELLY & WALSH, LIMITED.

Hongkong, 18th February, 1895.

THE CLUB HOTEL, METROPOLE.

5, BUND, YOKOHAMA.

1, TSUKIJI, TOKYO.

FIRST-CLASS HOTELS, centrally situated, well-furnished, the Cuisine, under the foreign supervision of an approved Chef, has no equal. ENTIRE FOREIGN MANAGEMENT, Experienced English matron in attendance.

The Hotel steam-launch attends Steamers arriving and departing. Passengers are met at the Railway Station.

VISITORS have the option of messing either in TOKYO or YOKOHAMA, without extra charge—the only Hotel offering such an advantage. EUROPEAN HAIR DRESSER on the Premises.

Certified Guides are in attendance at both Hotels.

THE CLUB HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED, PROPRIETORS.

C. T. BENNY, Manager,

YOKOHAMA.

E. DEWETTE, Manager,

TOKYO.

[160]

BAY VIEW HOTEL.

THE "RAMSGATE" OF HONGKONG.

(On Shaw-ki-wan Road.)

THE POPULAR SUMMER RESORT, and TERMINUS of the only pleasant DRIVE to be had on the Island. "BAY VIEW" occupies the best situation on the Shaw-ki-wan Road, commands an excellent view of the Harbour, and is always open to the cool breezes from the Southward. Steam-launches can at any time come alongside the jetty adjoining the spacious lawn.

To the other attractions of this popular resort

BATHING PAVILIONS

have been added, and a LAUNCH runs from the NEW PEDDER'S WHARF to BAY VIEW every half-hour after 5 P.M. daily.

Private Dinners or Tiffin prepared in First-class style on the shortest notice, and Meals can be served at all hours.

Hongkong, 15th August, 1894. [119]

THOMAS' GRILL ROOMS.

(Corner of Queen's Road and Dundall Street.)

THE Undersigned has always thought that such a place as this was the one thing needed to fit in between HOTEL LIFE and the PRIVATE BOARDING HOUSE—providing it be First-class in every detail. A place where one may have his GRILLED CHOP or STEAK at any hour of the Day, up to 11 P.M., or later if notice be given. He is also prepared to SUPPLY MEALS to PRIVATE PARTIES per Menu or ORDER—the Parties sending Diabets, &c., for same—and Cash. Terms:—

Breakfast...per meal...2s. 7s. 6d. Month...£12
Tiffin...per meal...2s. 7s. 6d. Month...£12
Dinner...per meal...2s. 7s. 6d. Month...£12
Breakfast, Tiffin and Dinner...£48
Breakfast and Tiffin...£30
Tiffin and Dinner...£40
SPECIAL TIFFINS and DINNERS served in Excellent Style at short notice.

W. THOMAS, Proprietor.

Hongkong, 14th June, 1894. [149]

Intimations.

TO SHIPMASTERS.

CAPTAIN F. H. PLUMMER,

(LATE OF THE PATAGONIAN NAVY.)

THE OLDEST STEVEDORE IN MANILA.

STEVEDORE AND CONTRACTOR.

COALS and all kinds of STORES

SUPPLIED on the shortest notice and on the most reasonable terms.

Manila, 5th October, 1895. [131]

TO SHIPMASTERS.

STEAM WATER-BOAT COMPANY.

THE Undersigned are prepared to SUPPLY

FRESH FILTERED WATER for both DECK

